



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/537,414

12/16/2005

Masao Yamada

1503.73148

1680

24978 7590 01/28/2009

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN
300 S WACKER DR
25TH FLOOR
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

HALPERN, MARK

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1791

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/28/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

- 1) Acknowledgement is made of Amendment received 11/18/2008. Claims 1, 3, 5, 49, 51 are amended and claims 2, 4 are cancelled. Claims 6-48, 52 remain withdrawn. Claims 1, 3, 5, 49-51 are under consideration.

Information Disclosure Statement

- 2) The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

The prior art references recited in the Specification (as, for example, recited on Pages 2-4) are to be listed on form PTO-1449 and copies of foreign references are to be provided for review.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

- 3) Claims 1, 3, 5, 49-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing

Art Unit: 1791

to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 1 now recites phrase "in which a ratio between a weight of the waste paper to be disintegrated and a weight of water used for disintegration is 1:0.65-7". The claimed ratio of waste paper to water is not described in the original Specification and is considered as new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4) Claims 1, 3, 5, 49-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 now recites phrase "in which a ratio between a weight of the waste paper to be disintegrated and a weight of water used for disintegration is 1:0.65-7". The claimed ratio of waste paper to water is not clear since it is not described in the original Specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5) Claims 1, 3, 5, 49, 51, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kimura (JP 11-293578).

Claims 1: Kimura discloses a system for disintegrating a waste paper stock in a dry condition by supplying a water mist content of 8-12% of water based on the dry waste paper (Abstract, entire document and figure). This represents a waste paper to water used ratio of (0.92) - (0.88) : (0.08) - (0.12). It is inherent or in the least it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made that the amount of water mist used by Kimura be sufficient to perform waste paper disintegration in the system of the present invention. The amount of water used in the disintegration process does not structurally differentiate the claimed system over the prior art system.

Claim 3: Kimura discloses additive such as a polyisocyanate compound added to form a substance having certain properties.

Claim 5: the amount of water to be added is a matter to be appropriate optimized during the system operation. Addition of an adhesive agent, filler and coloring of a fiber material are additions of components regularly used for manufacturing of paper articles.

Claims 49, 51: it would have been obvious to utilize vessels of any shape and structure. Product formed to be used as culture soil or as fertilizer does not structurally differentiate the present invention over the cited prior art.

6) Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura in view of Nishimura (JP 7-82686). Kimura is applied as above for claim 1, Kimura fails to disclose adding a fire retardant to waste paper pulp fibers to serve as incombustible material. Nishimura discloses adding a fire retardant to waste paper pulp fibers to serve as incombustible material (Abstract). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kimura and Nishimura because such a combination would expand the applicability of the Kimura product as a flame resistant product.

Response to Amendment

7) Claims 1-5, 49-51 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is withdrawn in view of amended claims.

8) Claims 1-5, 49, 51 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura (JP 11-293578), is withdrawn in view of amended claims.

Art Unit: 1791

9) Applicant's arguments filed 11/18/2008, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant alleges that the cited prior art, Kimura, does not disclose a ratio between a weight of the waste paper to be disintegrated and a weight of water used for disintegration to be 1:0.65-7.

Kimura discloses a system for disintegrating a waste paper stock in a dry condition by supplying a water mist content of 8-12% of water based on the dry waste paper. This represents a waste paper to water used ratio of (0.92) - (0.88) : (0.08) - (0.12). It is inherent or in the least it would have been obvious that the amount of water mist used by Kimura be sufficient to perform waste paper disintegration in the system of the present invention. The amount of water used in the disintegration process does not structurally differentiate the claimed system over the prior art system.

Conclusion

10) Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 1791


mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11) Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Halpern whose telephone no. is 571-272-1190.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

/Mark Halpern/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1791

Serial Number 	Application No. 10/537,414	Applicant(s) YAMADA, MASAO	
	Examiner Mark Halpern	Art Unit 1791	